



Cross-institutional strategies for promoting an engaged professoriate

Emily Donnelly-Sallee, Associate Professor, Park University [emily.donnelli@park.edu]
Melissa Mace, Executive Director, Missouri Campus Compact [melissamace@missouristate.edu]

Keywords: Faculty development effectiveness, institutional context, Campus Compact, engaged teaching

Conference track: Faculty

Format: Poster presentation

Summary

Faculty development is integral to the sustainability of community-engaged teaching and scholarship; recent years have witnessed steady growth in institutional initiatives, programs, and resource allocation specifically devoted to faculty development for engagement. In its 2010 survey of more than 1,100 member colleges and universities, Campus Compact found that 64% of responding campuses offered institutional support for faculty involvement including pedagogical workshops, materials for reflection and assessment, course models and syllabi, teaching awards, and sabbaticals for service-learning program development and research. Indeed, the nature, scope, and effectiveness of faculty development

for engagement have emerged as a generative area of inquiry for scholars (Bringle & Hatcher, 1996, 1997, 2000; Driscoll, 2008; Holland, 2010; O'Meara, 2005).

Opportunities to capture a more nuanced view of faculty development for engagement can be seized by considering the influence of institutional context, thereby connecting the knowledge of faculty development professionals across institution types. To explore the ways that faculty development for engagement is enabled and constrained by institutional context, researchers surveyed Campus Compact member institutions across the country.

The primary objectives of this research were to: (a) uncover where faculty development for engagement resides at various institution types, (b) identify the kinds of faculty development initiatives offered and incentives for engaged teaching and scholarship, (c) identify institutional factors that contribute to the greatest successes and that represent the greatest barriers to faculty involvement, and (d) discover strategies and principles for promoting engaged teaching and scholarship of relevance across institution types.

In sharing the results of this inquiry, we will draw upon the history of generalist faculty development sketched by Sorcinelli et al. (2006) whose analysis of faculty development over the last three decades in particular – the age of the developer (1980s), the age of the learner (1990s), and the age of the networker (2000s) – will help describe existing faculty initiatives for engagement as well as offer suggestions for future development.

References

There were no references provided with this proposal.

Comment: Author, would you like to provide references?